

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached Replacement Sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This Replacement Sheet, which includes Figures 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including Figures 1 and 2. In Figure 1, a “Prior Art” label has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the Office Action. No claims are amended herein. Claims 1-25, 27-32, and 37-42 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the aforementioned amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the convenience and reference of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

I. General Considerations

Applicant notes that the remarks and amendments presented herein have been made merely to clarify the claimed embodiments from elements purported by the Examiner to be taught by the cited references. Such remarks, or a lack of remarks, and amendments are not intended to constitute, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence, on the part of the Applicant: as to the purported teachings or prior art status of the cited references; as to the characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner; or as to any other assertions, allegations or characterizations made by the Examiner at any time in this case. Applicant reserves the right to challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of the cited references at any appropriate time.

In addition, the remarks herein do not constitute, nor are they intended to be, an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed herein are presented solely by way of example. Consistent with the foregoing, the discussion herein is not intended, and should not be construed, to prejudice or foreclose contemporaneous or future consideration, by the Applicant, of additional or alternative distinctions between the claims of the present application and the references cited by the Examiner, and/or the merits of additional or alternative arguments.

II. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figure 1 because it does not include a "Prior Art" label. As required by the Examiner, Applicant has amended Figure 1 herein to include a "Prior Art" label. In light of this amendment to Figure 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to Figure 1 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant respectfully notes that a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference. Further, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Finally, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (“MPEP”) § 2131.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25, 27-32, and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,099,382 to Aronson et al. (“*Aronson*”). Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that for at least the reasons set forth below, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Each of the pending independent claims 1, 12, 23, 29, and 31, requires “a pass-through port” and “a [] pass-through path.” In the rejection of each of the pending independent claims 1, 12, 23, 29, and 31, the Examiner has asserted that *Aronson* teaches “a pass-through port” and “a pass-through path.” *Office Action*, pages 4 and 6-8. In support of that assertion, the Examiner has made only general references to Figures 12A-12D, Figures 13A-13D, and Figure 14, as well as column 10, line 9-67; column 11, lines 1-22; column 12, lines 44-67; and column 13, lines 1-59 of *Aronson*.

As is evident from the generalized references to *Aronson* set forth in the Office Action, the Examiner has failed to specifically identify any correspondence between elements purportedly disclosed in *Aronson* and the “a pass-through port” and “a [] pass-through path” recited in rejected claims 1, 12, 23, 29, and 31. As the foregoing makes clear, the vague rejection stated by the Examiner has left Applicant to guess at which element(s) of *Aronson* the Examiner believes to correspond to the “a pass-through port” and “a [] pass-through path” of claims 1, 12, 23, 29 and 31. However, Applicant respectfully declines to do so, inasmuch as it is the burden of the Examiner to establish anticipation.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1, 12, 23, 29, and 31, and claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-28, 30, 32, and 37-42 which depend therefrom, should be withdrawn at least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Aronson* teaches “a pass-through port” and “a [] pass through path” that is “configured to selectively couple...[a] signal...to the pass-through port” as required by those claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks submitted herein, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the claims 1-25, 27-32, and 37-42 pending in this application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections is requested and allowance of those claims is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 25th day of May, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter F. Malen Jr./

Peter F. Malen Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,576
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800